

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance based on the comments below are respectfully requested.

Claimed "Assumption"

The Examiner has stated that the claimed "assumption that the normal pixels are lost using said different interpolation method" recited in claims 1 and 4 has not been given patentable weight. The Examiner asserts that the "assumption" "does not further limit the step of test interpolation data calculation." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicant respectfully submit that the "assumption" certainly alters the manner in which interpolation is performed by allowing such interpolation techniques to be performed on good pixels, those which are not missing or corrupted. To do this, an assumption is made that an interpolation is needed for that pixel. This is done in order to obtain a result that can be compared with the actual value of that pixel. The actual interpolation techniques, once the assumption is made, may not be different from prior art techniques, but the manner in which the techniques used on actual missing or corrupted pixels is selected is certainly different from the prior art. A comparison between the test interpolation data and actual pixel data for the same pixel can't be made without such an assumption and selection of the best techniques based on this comparison can't be performed without such an assumption.

Thus, the recited "assumption" clearly is an inventive concept when viewed in connection with the other recited claimed elements and must be given patentable weight. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner properly examine claims 1-7 by giving the claimed "assumption" patentable weight during the examination.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashibe et al (JP 363122385) in view of Jiang (US 7,242,819) and claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Ashibe, Jiang and Utagawa (US 6,563,538). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Ashibe et al.

Ashibe discloses an image data compression method by thinning pixel data from an original image. In the method disclosed in Ashibe, a frame of image data is divided into predetermined size of blocks, e.g., 4 X 4 pixels, and a different thinning ratio is applied to each block as shown in Figs. 3(a)-(d).

Figs. 3(a)-(d) each shows a different interpolating method used for a block thinned at different ratios; Fig. 3(a) shows an original block image, Fig. 3(b) shows an interpolating method used for a block thinned at a ratio of 1/2, Fig. 3(c) shows an interpolating method used for a block thinned at a ratio of 3/4, Fig. 3(d) shows another interpolating method used for a block thinned at the ratio 3/4. The method shown in Fig. 3(d) uses two adjacent frames for interpolation.

The three patterns of interpolations shown in Figs. 3(b)-(d) are performed for each block at those different ratios. Then, difference between the original image block and interpolated image block is calculated for the three patterns, and the thinning ratio and associated interpolation method by which this difference is minimized are selected for each block.

As describe above, Ashibe teaches selection of an interpolation method at which the interpolation error is minimized. However, the interpolation method in Ashibe is selected block by block, so that the original image data is thinned with minimum error. In contrast, as recited in claims 1 and 4 interpolation techniques are determined for generating an interpolation pixel, which interpolates a lost pixel, and the selection of an interpolating method is made for each lost pixel.

Thus, Ashibe fails to teach interpolation techniques at the pixel level and comparison of techniques to determine the best interpolation technique for each pixel. Thus, Ashibe fails to teach, *inter alia*, calculating interpolation candidate data of the same interpolation pixel, as recited in claims 1 and 4.

Further, Jiang and Utagawa fail to remedy the deficiencies of Ashibe. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion


For at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 are distinguished from the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 30, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Chad J. Billings
Registration No.: 48,917
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant